¶ A newe

worke concernyng both partes of the Sacrament to be receyued of the lay people as well vnder the kinde of wyne as vnder the kynd of bread, with certen other articles, concernyng the masse and the auctorite of Bysshops, the chapters whereof are contayned in the next leafe

made by Philip
Melanchton
and
newly translated out
of Latyn.

Roman. 8,
¶ If God be with vs, who can be against vs

BIBLIOTECA BODLEIANA

¶ The some & effect of the hole boke.

That the lay people ought to recepue the whole sacramēt vnder both kindes, as wel as the prist, & not only one part therof. Secondly: that the masse is no sacrifice neither to be applyed or done for other, whether they be alyue or dead. In the which chapter it is euidently proued, that priuate & soule masses are contrary to the scripture, & that it is idolatry to heare, or to saye, such priuate or soul masses. Thirdly, that the comō masse done daply for the peple to come vnto, to heare it only, & to see the eleuacion, wherin the prist recepueth the hole sacramēt alone, the presēt peple not partaking with him, is also agaynst the scripture, & therfor to be abolysshed and disanulled.

¶ Fortly that bysshops haue no auctorite more than other pristes by the worde of God, wherin are contepued these sentences folowyng.

¶ That the lay peple may chose Bysshops and pastors.

¶ That no Bysshop hath any auctorite to make any ordinance agaynst the worde of God, nor to change, alter or disanull any ordinaunce of God.

That the Sacrament of the body & bloode of Christe owght to be ministred wholy, that is to say, in both kyndes. Some men are discontent, sayng that we contend of a thing vnnecessary whan we require this sacrament to be restored vnto hys first institucion. And they complayne that al the stryfe and contencyon in that matter is of no effect, nor to no purpose. I wold such men shuld knowe, that we cõtend of no light matter, whã we go about the restitutiõ of this sacrament, for we teache and instructe therwith all men, of the true vse of the sacramentes, and how mẽ may exercyse and strengthen their fayth by the vse of the sacramẽtes. Itẽ we instruct thẽ also of the horryble abuses whiche be in the masse. And finally this sentẽs is, as it were by the way declared, whether it be lawful for any mã to alter or abolysh any ryte of Christes institucyon, or no. Wherfore we entreate of hyghe and earnest matters

The Sacrament ought to be geuen
ers in this contenciō: we speake of the
vse of the sacramentys, of the horry-
ble abusys of the masse, and of the au-
ctorite of the church. And these be the
causes why our aduersarys wold not
haue this sacrament to be wholly mi-
nistred. First because they extolle the
power of popes and Bysshops. And
they wold thē to haue auctorite to al-
ter thynges institute and ordeyned of
God, and to make new lawes, doctry-
nes & ordinances to worshyp god with
despde and contrary to those which be
tawght in the scripture. Secondarely,
they see and perceyue that the ryght &
true doctryne of thys sacrameat doth
nothyng agree with the abuses of the
masse. And therfore they labor with
toth and naple to kepe downe and op-
presse the true doctryne of the vse of
this sacrament. Wherfore I hartely
desyre al vertuous & christē readers to
consyder, how necessary it were vnto
the church of god, to haue the vse and
vtylyte of the Sacramentis playnely
and trnly taught and set furth to the
peple, that they myght knowe how to
exercise

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.
exercyse & strenthen theyr fayth truely by thē, and agayne what auctorite the church hath by the word of god in makyng lawes and ordinances. And all godly hartes must be monysshed yea and accustomed to rule & stablish their fayth & lyfe by the word of God, and not by mennys fansys, that whā they wyl worshyp God, they may haue the sure worde of God to leane vnto, as Dauid sayth. Thy word is the lyghte vnto my fete. But let vs come nerer to the matter. Lyke as our Lord Jesus Christ saith. I haue hartily desyred to eate this paschal lāb with you, declarynge therby, that he was desyrous to shew some tokē, & to leaue behynd him some pledge of hys loue toward vs, & that he hym selfe wolde be a sacrifyce for vs: so lykewyse let vs receyue the benefyght offred vnto vs, and the Sacrament therof with most feruent desyre. And that we may vse thys Sacrament reuerently: let vs heare & folowe the voyce of Christ, & learne, by what meanes thys Sacrament may profyght all christen and godly hartes.

The Sacrament ought to be geuen for these thynges shal make vs more to regarde the true reuerence therof. The wordes of the gospel concerning the institucyon of thys Sacrament be knowne welinowgh. Wherunto christ addeth a cõmandement sayng do thys in my remembraunce, here he commãdeth vs to do that which he dyd. Wher vpon it folowyth, that al mẽ owght to receyue it wholy vnder both kyndes,

By what meanes the Sacrament may'pro fyght the receyuers

And by thys meanys it profyteth all consciencys, namely whan they repent for theyr synnys beleuyng, that christ is made the sacrifyce and oblacyon for synne, and whan they quycken theyr fayth by receyuynge thys pledge and token, beleuynge theyr synnes to be forgeuen them for christes sake, and them selues to be partakers of christes benyfyghtes, and thus comfort them selues, prayfyng, & geuyng thãkes vnto God for thys hygh benefyte, and reioysyng openly for it. Wbiche prayse they ought to declare in theyr whole lyfe and conuersacion. For all the accyons and workes in thys lyfe, all study and diligence in the gouer-

nance

nance of a commō welth or of an hou-
sold, ought to be done for this end and
purpose, to testifye, that we desyre to
honor God truly, and that we knowe-
lege and also receyue the benefyghtes
of God, geuen vnto vs thorow his son
thankefully. Of thys exercyse of fay-
the in vsyng of the sacrament, the pa-
pystes speake neuer a word. And the
abuses of the masse do vtterly quēche
and kepe downe this doctrine necessa-
ry for all consciences, but we shall spe-
ake more largely of thys hereafter.
Wherfor let vs now reforme to proo-
ue, that the vse of the whole sacramēt
owght to be restored, that is to say,
that it ought be vsed vnder both kyn-
des.

¶ The first reason.

SEing no man ought to al-
ter a mans Testament
or last wyll, much lesse
ought any mā to alter the
testament or last wyll of
God, as Paul saith vnto the Galathy
ans. But the supper of the Lorde is

The Sacrament ought to be geuen a specyall sacrament of Christes newe testament or last wyll (as Christ hym self sayth: this is the cup of the newe testament) wherfor it is not lawfull, nor neuer was for any man, to alter this ordinance, or to abolyshe and take away any part therof. This reason is so strong, that nothing of any effect can be answered or spoken agaynst it. For it is certen that Christe dyd so institute this ordinance that al Christen and vertuous men, aswell lay men, as prestes, shuld vse both partes of the sacramēt. For the text speaketh of the cup by name, sayng, drinck all of this. And this word (All) is added that we shuld vnderstand that no membre of the church shuld be excluded or forbidden from it. And Paul speaketh manifestly thes wordes .·. I receyued of the Lorde that which I haue deliuered vnto you etc. And he commanded the whole church of the Corinthes to vse the whole sacramēt without any mutylyng of it, as the whole circumstāce of the text doth testyfye. Let euery man proue hymselfe, sayth he, and so

let

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.
let hym eate of thys bread and drynke of thys cup etc. And there is no doubte but that it was so vsed both in the greke, and romane church many yeares. And there be many tokens and argumentes that it is scarsely .iiij. hundreth yeares syns it was altered. Nor there is no certenty, how or by what auctorite the true ordinance and old custome was changed. And yet notwithstondyng al thys, (that it hath bene vsed but of late yeares, by whose ordynance no man can tel, agaynste the expresse commandement of God, and also agaynst the vse of the church in olde tyme (yet, I say) it is defended with such obstinacy and cruelnesse as the church of God (which is full of al gentylnes and pity) doth abhorre.

The testimonies of the doctors and old fathers.

SAynt Cyprian in the first boke of hys Pistels the .ij. chap. where he speketh of lay me which were martres, sayth thus. By what reason can we teach or exhort men to spende their blode

The Sacrament ought to be geuen blode in the confession of Christ, seing we denye them the blode of Christ? Or by what meanes can we make thē mete for the cup of marterdome if we do not admyt them to receyue before, the cup of the Lord, together with the whole congregacyon. And there be many such places in Cyprianes Pystels as in the second boke and thyrde Pistel, where he speaketh of the cuppe of the Lord to be sanctifyed and ministred vnto the people. Saynt Hierom vpon the thyrde chapter of Sophony, sayth thus. The Prestes ought to minister the Sacrament and to distribute the blode of the Lorde vnto hys people &c. In tripartita historia in the .ix. boke: these wordes be spoken vnto Theodosius the Emperor. How canst thou receyue the holy body of the Lord with blody handes. How darest thow be so bold, as to tast of the cup of the most precios blode, seyng thow hast shed so moch innocēt blode. In the decreis (de cōsecratione) the second distinction, there is a canon of Gelasius Bisshop of Rome, which forbiddeth

to the layte vnder boht kyndes.
biddeth that one part of the Sacramēt shuld be separate from another, & thes be the wordes. Uve vnderstonde, that there be certen parsons which receiue the one part of the sacramēt only, and absteyne from the cup of the holy blode, which parsons we warne, that they receyue, eyther the whole sacramēt, or els that they absteine from the whole. For there can be no separacion of this one mistery, without greàt sacrilege. Loo, thys canō calleth it sacrilege to separate the partes of the sacramēt. But our aduersaris wold auoyd this testimony with a very false cauillacion: for they say that it cōcerneth priestes only & not lay mē, which to be a very false cauillaciō it may be perceyued by this because at that time they vsed the whole sacrament: & wheras he sayth let thē absteyne from both, he speaketh of lay mē, that thei shuld be kept frō it, & forbiddē by the ministers. There is also a playne confirmaciō of this, in a certen councel called cōciliū tolletanū, which shewith that lay men dyd than vse the whole sacrament, we se also in diuerse

Concilium Tolletanum

old

The Sacrament ought to be geuen
old bokes, that haue bene fownd in the
churches in Germany (wherin the ma
ner of mimistring the sacramēt is writ-
ten & noted that it is plainly affirmed
that the whole sacramēt was geuē vn
to the people. And I heare say, that su
che bokes be fownd also in frāce. And
they say, that the ffrenche kyng doth
styl vse the old maner, & receyueth the
sacramēt in both kyndes. I wold alled
ge the Greke authors also, but that al
men do knowe that theyr churches do
minister it vnto the peple in both kyn-
des. Seyng therfor that it is manifest,
that this sacramēt is so institute in the
Gospell, that both the prestes and the
lay sorte shuld vse together the whole
sacrament (ffor almuch as it is certen
that this custom dyd long also remai-
ne in the vniuersall church) it is euidēt
that they which forbyd the one part,
(that is to say the wyne) and defende
this prohibicion to be lawful, that thei
do wrong. There is a comon saiynge
in the old doctors that the churche can
neyther alter the substance nor yet the
forme of any sacramēt. But here it is

playn

to the laye vnder both kyndes.

playne that the substance is altered. Wherfor, as I sayd before, the holynesse of Christes testament is minished by this alteration. Now wil I make an other argument.

¶ The second reason.

VVhosoener maketh any ordinance agaynst the cõmandement of God, doth synne: accordynge to the saying of Paul: VVhosoeuer teacheth auother gospel, accursed be he &c But whosoeuer forbiddyth the one part of the sacramẽt, maketh an ordinãce agaynst the cõmandemẽt of god. ffor these be the wordes of hys commandemẽt, whã he ordeyned the sacrament. Take it and drinke it &c. Item let euery man proue hymself, and so eate of thys breade and drinck of thys cup. Ergo they synne that forbyd it.

It is sinne to forbid the whole Sacrament to bedelt to the lay people.

¶ The third reason.

PAul commanded thys Sacramẽt to be ministred, as he tawght it, but yll the glorious commyng of Christ and he wylleth also, the deth of christ to be shewyn forth, that is to say that preachynges of Christes benifightes shuld

The Sacrament ought to be geuen tes shu d be had, that the rememberā-ce therof, fayth, and thanckes geuing shuld goo together in the vse of this sa crament.

The pre achyng of christes benifightes ought to be had whā soeuer the Sacrament is receyued.

¶ These thynges be sore changed now. For first one part only of the sacrament is ministred vnto the people, where as Paul speketh of the whole, sayng as oft as ye eate of thys breade, and drinck of this cup. Here the whole sacramēt is described. Furthermore it is now ministred in al places in a maner, without any prechyng at al, as it is in priuate masses. And agayn, it is geuē to the peple, but ones in a yeare. And thā what cā be taught in so short space, yf any thyng be taught at all? And as for the doctryne of christes benifightes, of the exercise of fayth, and of the vse of the sacramentes, oure aduersarys corrupt and peruert it diuerse wayes. For where as Paule sayth, that they which abuse thys sacramēt, be gilty of the body and blode of christ no dowt the autors and maynteyners of so many horrible abuses of this sacramēt do greuously offend. They forbid

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
bid the one part therof. Thei diffigure the Sacrament due vnto the peple into an heathnysh sacrifyce for other mennys synnes, which is contrary to the doctrine of Christes deth, & thus they destroy the true doctrine. Do they thinck that God wil not punysshe these abuses? For although Christ prescribed no tyme to receyue it, yet he dyd not leane it vnto vs in vayn, but wolde that it shulde be often vsed in the church, of them that be of age. And whan we vse it, we ought to kepe that forme and order which Christe dyd appoynt. Wherfor they offend, which vse not that forme & order. These reasons are sufficient for them that wyll prefer the worde of God before mennis imaginacions, and for them which thinke that we ought not to swarue from the ordinance of god for any mānys fansy. But because many cauillaciōs are obiect agaynst vs, I wyll briefly answer vnto them all.

The first obiection with the confutacion therof.

There

The Sacrament ought to be geuen

There be some which graunt that the vse of the whole Sacrament is institute of the gospell, and that it was so vsed also in the primitiue church, but they say that it may be altered, because it is a free thyng to vse the whole sacrament, or one part therof. And they say, there is lyke libertie in the whole and in the part, but it is lawfull to abstayne from the whole sacrament, ergo also from a part therof. First I answere that though it were lawfull to abstayne from the whole sacramẽt. Yet whã we vse it we ought to vse it whole. For the partes therof are vnseparable. For it is not lawfull to change, or to alter Gods testament. Wherfor this obiection is to be vnderstond of such thynges as haue separable partes. And furthermore, I deny that it is lawful to abstayne from the whole sacrament: for al that be of age, and membres of Christes congregacion, are commãded by Christ to vse it, although, he appoynted no certẽ tyme. For the ministracion therof muste be obserued and kept euen tyl the end

of the

to the layte vnder both kyndes.

of the worlde, as Paul sayth in expresse wordes. As oft as ye eate of this bread and drinck of thys cup, shewe ye preach forth the Lordes death vntyll he come. He commandeth also the remẽberaunce and preachyng of Christes death to be had, whan soeuer it is ministred, euẽ vntyl the glorious comynge of Christ. Why haue the Bysshoppes now contemned Paulys sayng in chãgyng the vse of the sacrament, in peruertyng the doctryne of sayth and of Christes benifightes, in neglectyng al maner of preaching and in compelling the peple to receyue one parte of the sacrament only, and yet they teach no fruite therof neyther: Paul sayth that all they are guilty of the body and blode of the Lord, which abuse this sacrament. Wherfor I say ones agayne, that vndowtedly the authors and mayntenners of these abuses do greuously offend.

¶ Another obiection.

The gospell granteth fre liberty in vsyng of all sacramentes, accordyng to the sayeng of Christ,

The Sacrament ought to be geuen the kyngdom of god compyth not with any outward obseruacion of tyme or place, wherfor we haue liberty to vse this Sacrament as we wyll.

Here these suttyl marchantes amplify the liberty of the gospel goynge about to vexe vs there with, as though we were more obstinate and superstitious in defending thys matter, thā the Jewys were in defendynge theyr ceremonyes. They say, that the quietnes of the church, is to be preferred before the outward ministracyon of any ceremony, as it is written, I desyre mercy rather than sacrifice. And many lyke obiectyons are made by crafty sophisters, vnto all which I wyl answer brefely. The Gospel grantethno liberty to teach any thyng agaynst the commandement of God or to abolysh or prohibite any part of any commandement of God that pertayneth to the church. But the Gospel commandeth the office of ministracyon to be ryghtly vsed, which consisteth in preachyng and in ministryng the Sacramentes. Now yf a man, for thys liberty, wolde

teache

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
teache, that baptyme myght be left, he ought to be cursed. Lykewyse in thys case, the prohibicyon of the one kynde is a wicked thyng. For it taketh away a part of Gods ordinance, But the lyberty of the Gospell, delyuereth all that be godly from the Leuitical ceremonys, and from al mans tradicions. But perpetually to forbyd the vse of both kyndes, & to defend it with suche cruelnes of punyshmēt, is not to maintayne the liberty of the Gospell, but rather to oppresse it and to abolysh also a part of Gods ordinance.

¶ Another obiectyon.

The church for some vrgent cause may change any thyng in the vse of the Sacramētes, as the apostles changed the forme of baptym as it is sayd in the actes. Let euery one be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ. And there be many causes which seme very probable for the whith it is expedyent to debarre the laye sort of the one kynd, that the Sacrament may be had in the greater reuerence.

The Sacrament ought to be geuen And agayn parte of it myght hap to drop owt of the chales vpon the erth. Item the wyne wareth sone sowre, wherfore it coulde not be kept longe. Item it is a good example to teach the liberty of the gospel, and many suche reasons there be. Wherfor it semeth resonable, that for these causes the church myght alter somwhat in thys matter. Now to all these wyll I answere in order.

The church can not change any ordinance of God.

¶ Fyrst I denye that the church for any cause, be it neuer so vrgent, maye change or alter any commandement of God: accordyng to thys saiyng: who soeuer teacheth any other Gospel, accursed be he. And as concernyng the example of the Apostles for the baptizyng. I answere, that the text maketh no mencyon in no place that the Apostles dyd vse thys forme. I baptize the in the name of Christ: notwithstōding this maner of speakyng (to be baptized in the name of Christ) is often rehersed in the scripture, and it is as much to say, as to be made a mēbre of Christ, as Paul sayth vnto the Roma-

nes

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
nes: ye be baptized into Christ Jesus.
But let vs graut that the Apostles
dyd so speake, what maketh this vnto
any prohibicion. Dyd the Apostles
forbyd in any place the other forme of
baptizyng. There is as great differēce
betwene the Apostles and the Bys-
shops, as was betwene the Prophetes
and other Priestes. Elizeus by a spe-
cyall iniunction and by an excellent
hygh mocyon of the holy Ghost, dyd
annoynte newe kynges, which thynge
was not lawfull for other to do. Euen
so the Apostels do excell the Bys-
shops both in theyr callynge and also
in the gyftes wherwith they are ende-
wed. But yet it was not lawfull for
the Apostels to forbyd any ordinance
or forme tawght of Christ. Wherfore
although they myght vse other wor-
des for some consyderacyon, yet thys
example is no patern to any perpetu-
all prohibicyon of any thyng which ab
rogateth or suppressyth the ordinance
of God. Now let vs come vnto the
dangers that are obiect for droppyng
owt of the chales, etc. Paul sayth that

The Sacrament ought to be geuen
mans tradicions haue a certen shewe
of wysdom. And yet there is no tradi-
cyon so beggarly but may be painted
The tru reuerence of the Sacrament. with excellent clokes and colors, of
conyng craftes men. This is the hy-
ghest reuerence that can be geuen vn-
to the sacrament, in no wyse to swar-
ue from the word of God, and to tea-
che the churche to knowe the wyll of
God by no other thynge, than by the
worde of God. This is the peculyar
That which falleth vpon the erth is no part of the Sacrament wisdom of the church. And thys reue
rence doth God allowe. But to be ca-
refull lesse any drop shuld fall out of
the chales, is but a childisshnes and
a thynge not much pertaynyng to the
principall matter. For that only is the
Sacrament, which is ministred vnto
man in the congregacyon. And as for
that which the mows doth eate or that
which droppeth vpon the earth, is no
part of any Sacrament, though it be
consecrate a thowsand tymes. For Sa-
cramentes are than Sacramētes, whā
thay be ministred and dyrect vnto that
end and vse, whervnto they were insti
tute & ordeyned. If they feare lesse the

wyne

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
wyne shuld war sowr, why feare they not lykewyse lesse the bread shuld war mowld: wherfor it were better to consecrate thē only imediatly before they shuld vse them. But these imagined dangers and perels, cā not excuse the prohibicion therof. And where as thei alledge for them, that there is not wyne in all places, that maketh nothynge agaynst vs, for why do they than forbyd it in those places wher wyne may be had: And Christ speketh not namely of wyne but of the cup. And therfor there be certē peple in the lād of Ruse which as it is sayd) do cōsecrate a certen liquor made of wyne and hemp.

¶ Another obiection.

OUr aduersarys seke examples of liberty vsed in thys Sacrament. In Luke there is mencion made of breakyng of bread. Lykewyse in the actes of the Apostles it is sayde thus. Breakyng bread in al places frō howse to howse. These places seme to speake of the Lordes supper, whiche seynge they make mencyon of Luke xxiiij.

The Sacrament ought to be geuen bread only, it is sufficient, say they, to vse the one part of the sacrament only To thys wyll I answere brefely.

I say that the sacrament was not first instituted in those places. Neyther is it certen, whether those places speake of the Sacrament or no. For by breakyng of bread, after the cultomable speakyng of the Iewys. is vnderstand generally a feast, as it is written in Esay, breake thy bread vnto the hungry, that is to say, gyue hym parte of thy bread. But I wyl not reproue the comon perswasyon of the old wryters which suppose that christ dyd there minister the Sacrament of hys body and blode vnto those. ij. which walked with hym. And it is credible ynowgh, that the Apostles dyd preach euery where in theyr frendes howses, and at theyr feastes that they dyd distribute the sacrament vnto the godly hearers, Let vs graunt therfor that the text speaketh of the Lordes supper. There is a figure called synecdoche, which is comonly vsed in the scripture: by the which figure, the whole thyng is vnderstond

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.
derstoud and signifyed, wha one part only is named. And thus in thys place by the breakyng of bread is vnderstond the whole supper. Wherfor it comprehendeth the drinck also. Thys is a playne and a true answer. And let our aduersarys stryue as much as they wyll. they shall neuer by these testimonys excuse their prohibicion of the wyne. For it foloweth not, that because in these places the bread onely is mencyoned, therfore it is lawfull for the church to forbyd the other part of the sacrament, cõtrary to the expresse commandement, which is red in the institucyon therof. It were no hard thynge to iudge whether thys be a good reason or no. They alledge also other examples owt of storys, where it is mencyoned that the Sacrament was borne abowt in baskettes. And thys do they vnderstond of the breade onely. But Eusebius and. S. Hierome also, do affirme that both partes were vsed to be borne vnto the sycke. For Eusebius sayth thus in the first boke, he gaue (sayth he) a litle of the Sacra-

ment

The Sacrament ought to be geuen ment vnto a chyld that came vnto him whiche he bad to be powred into a cup and to be geuen to the olde man hys master. Here now, is made mencyon of one part onely and yet here is vnderstond the whole Sacrament. And saynt Hierom speaketh yet more plainly vnto Exuperius, in these wordes, Whatcan be ryther than he which beareth the Lordes body in a basket and hys blode in a glasse &c. Thus are all lyke places to be vnderstond wheras mencion is made of bearyng abowte the Sacrament, except the one part be forbidden by expresse wordes. The storys do shewe plainly ynowgh, that the comon people dyd vse the sacramēt in both kyndes in all places. Wherfor al dowtfull examples must be vnderstond after the common vse of the tyme. And yf there were any examples contrary yet they excuse not the prohibicyon of the wyne to be lawful.

¶ Another obiection.

IN the bread is the liuely body of Christ gyuen ergo the blode is con-

tayned

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.
tepned and geuen there alſo. Vvhiche thyng ſepng it is true, it is ſufficient to recepue the one part, for ſeyng vnder the body in the forme of bread is contepned the blode & vnder the blode in the forme of wyne is contepned the body, no man owght to make auy cõtrouerſy or contencyon. Lyke as whan the Apoſtles dyd baptyze in the name of Chriſt, they wold not withſtõdyng vnder the name of the ſon admonyſh the Jewys of the father alſo. And vnder the name of Meſſyas they dyd ſignifye that he wold gyue them the holy goſt alſo. Vvherfor now ſhuld we contend of the names, ſeyng one declareth another manifeſtly inowgh, lyke wyſe in thys ſacrament, why ſhuld we contend ſo much abowt the cup, ſeyng both the body and blode be geuen and miniſtred vnder the breade.

Thys obiectyon is taken owt of mãs naturall reaſon becauſe no body can be wythowt blode. I ſayd before, that mans tradiciõs haue an owtward ſhewe and appearance of wyſdome. They haue ſought wayes theſe many

yeares

The Sacrament ought to be geuen
yeares to excuse theyr newe and late
inuented opinyon. wherfore it is no
meruell though they haue imagyned
many suttell inuencions. Wherfore
I wyll answer to thys obiection in fe-
we wordes. I say, that the commande-
ment of God ought not to be broken
or blemysshed for any such fantasticall
imaginacyon of man. For God wyll
haue hys ordinãce obserued and kept.
God could gyue the holy Ghost with
out any water in baptyme, but yet he
wyll haue the outward sygne to be mi
nistred. God wyll be knowne by hys
worde and sacramentes institute by
hym. He wold not that we shuld insti
tute any newe sacramentes or signes,
as the hethen, papistes and monkes
haue set vp newe signes as ronnyng,
vnto certen grauen imagys where vn
to they wold bynd God by theyr false
perswasion. The Prophetes, Christe
hymself and the Apostles, do repro-
ue thys heynos vngodlynes, very
often. For they wyll haue vs to kno
we and receyue god by hys word and
by such sygnes and sacramentes as he
hath

hath geuen and delyuered vs. And God hath institute an ordre in hys church which he wyll haue kept, & he wyl not suffre it to be altered or changed for anys mans pleasure. Wherfore in this place, this is my answer. God wold that hys body and blode shulde be signifyed and represented vnto vs by .ij. dyuers elementes, that the remẽbrance of his blode shed for vs, might not be forgotten. Therfore we ought to kepe the forme institute of Christe, and to know that he is present where hys ordynance is kept, and worketh effectuously thorow it, whan it is vsed as he hath ordeyned it, for otherwyse they be not hys Sacramentes, neyther is he present at the ministracio of thẽ. And thys late prohibicion of the cup was not inuented for nawght, for lyke as the Vysshops haue forbiddẽ the Lordes cup to be ministred vnto the people, so haue they obscured and wyped cleane away the true doctryne of Christes blode, which wassheth away the synnes of al men. It hath also obscured the doctryne of the remyssyon

of synnes

The Sacrament ought to be geuen of synnes and of fayth. Which ought to be the effectes of the ministryng of the lordes cup. Now as they haue quē ched these effectes and vtylyteys, euē so haue they altered the forme of the Sacrament.

¶ Another obiection.

IT is expedient (say they) to haue some difference betwene prestes & lay men. And the withholding of the one kynd frō the layte, setteth a manifest difference. Wherfor it semeth that the church dyd wythdrawe the one kynde from the people for a reasonable cause. Oh wonderful shamelesnes: I knowe diuerse writers whiche alledge thys for an hygh cause, in defendynge thys prohibicion, and to extoll the dignite of prestes, they say that they only must vse the whole sacrament and that one part therof is inowgh for the layte. But thys childysshe persuasiō ought sharpely to be reproued and confuted. There is another difference than thys betwene the mynisters and the lay sort. Which can not be perfyghtly declared

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.

declared in thys place. It is the prestes office to mynyster the sacramēt: but in dysyng therof, there owghte to be no difference, for both the prist and the lay man owghte to vse the whole sacrament together, and to cōfort them selues together, to exercyse theyr faith together, and to gyue God thankes together in receyuinge thys pledge & tokē of the Lord together. And let the errors of offeryng and applyeng it for other be vtterly banysshed. ffor the popysshe prystes defend this differens in dysyng and receyuynge of the Sacrament, only to confirme and maintayne the wicked error of the oblacyon and applycacyon of it for other, that the worke of the prist receyuyng it alone in hys masse shuld be a thyng of more valew, than whan the lay men do bre therlye receyue it together. Seynge now the true vnderstondyng of the sacrament is violētly oppressed by thys false persuasyon, we must nedes crye out agaynst it. ffor sins that tyme that the papisticall sacrifycers began first to put a differēce betwene theyr work

The difference betwene the prist and the lay man.

and

The Sacrament ought to be geuen and the receyuyng of the lay men, there hath folowed an horryble Idolatry of priuate masses. Which must nedes be taken out of the church.

¶ Another obiection.

IN the first of the Corinth the. xi. chap. it is sayd. Whosoeuer eateth thys bread and drinketh of this cup vnworthily etc, Here Paul dyd vse thys separatiue syllabe, or, and in such sentences it is sufficient to receyue and obserue the one part of the sentence. Wherfore Paul granteth by that maner of speakyng, that it is sufficiēt to vse the one part only er. Oh the loue of the truth is the most noble vertu that can be, which loue ought to excel most specially in thē which haue auctorite to iudge spiritual controuersys, that the truth knowne we may haue some end of this sophistical bablynge. For they that loue not the truth wil euer imagyne some cauillacyō to shyft it of. For sophistry is neuer without shyftys. But to answer sincerely to the matter. Paul where he cōmādeth vs to vse this Sacrament, in the very

wordes

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
maundement he reherseth thyse the co-
pulatiue syllabe, and (sayng as oft as
ye eate of thys breade, and drinck of
thys cup, let euery man proue himself,
and, so eate of this breade & drinck of
the cup. These be the wordes of the in-
stitucyon and of the commandement
that we shuld vse both kindes. I pray-
se ther diligent in weyng of the wor-
des but I wold haue them to vse syn-
cerytie and truth in geuyng iudgemēt
or determinyng any thyng. Let them
mark with diligēce in what place Paul
vseth the particle, And, and in what
place he vseth. Or, where as he com-
mandeth to vse the whole Sacrament,
there he vseth, and, wherfor it is mani-
fest that he confirmeth the vse of both
partes of the sacramēt. And afterwar-
de speakyng of the ponyshment of the
that receyue it vnworthyly, he vseth
ones thys word, Or, to make his thre-
atenyng to seme more greuous & sharp
vnto them. And that the hearers or re-
aders myght know that they oughte
to shewe and gyue syche reuerence vn-
to both partes. Truth it is that both

The Sacrament ought to be geuen hey which come vnto the Sacramēt withowt any amendement of life, and likewyse those pristes which receyue it in theyr masses for lucres sake, they do greuously dishonor the Sacramēt. And yet, they do more greuously dyshonor it, which bryng not true repentance and perfygt fayth with them, whan thei come to receyue it. And thei also which teach not the trew doctrine of the vse therof. And finally thys is also an hygh blasphemy and dishonor vnto the Sacramente to forbyd and to robbe the people of one part therof. Wwhich blasphemy, seyng it perteineth peculiarly vnto the cup, thys dissunctyue syllabe. Or, compth well in place. For it is euident that thys syllabe reprooueth our aduersarys, and confirmeth our sentence. Let them be moued And warned therfor by thys sore and most sharp threatenyng, vnto repentaunce. And let them knowledge and graut. as the truth is, that they them selues be gilty of the body and blode of Christ. And so let them cease at length to defyle and pollute the blessed

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
ſed Sacramente with ſuche abuſes,
which they haue defended thus longe
with ſuche cruelnes and tyrannye. The
copulatyue ſyllabe, And, commandeth
vs to vſe both partes. And afterward
the diſiunctyue ſyllabe, Or, maketh
the threatenyng more ſore and ſharpe,
ſhewyng that men maye offend in this
behalfe more ways than one. For
which part ſoeuer of the Sacramente
thow doſt diſhonor, thow doſt grieuou
ſly offend God. And there be (as I
haue ſayd before) diuerſe and horry-
ble abuſes of thys Sacrament amoug
our aduerſarys. Now al theyr ob-
iectyons confuted, it is euydent e-
nowgh, that it is wicked & vngodly
to forbyd the one kynde, & that the vſe
of the whole Sacrament owght to be
reſtored agayn accordyng to the com-
mandement of Chriſt, and to the com-
mon cuſtome vſed in the whole primi-
tyue church many yeares. Let our ad-
uerſarys imagyne, inuente, and inuen
te agayne, what reaſons they wil, thei
ſhall neuer be able to defend theyr pro
hibycyon to be lawfull. If any man

The Sacrament ought to be geuen bringeth thys cause and reason onely, thus I cõmand, thus I wyll haue it, he taketh vpon hym a tyrannicall power in the church of God: wherin al consciences haue a rule which teacheth, that god must be more obeyed than al mẽ. It is lawfull for no prynce, pope, nor bysshop, to determyne any thyng concernyng the religion and honorynge of God, after their owne brayne and reason contrary to the commandement of God. And yet notwithstandyng, the hartes and myndes of prynces and rulers are prone vnto thys vyce, as the examples of dyuers great prynces both in our tyme and before vs, do manifestly declare.

And some of them are moued thorow superstycion and false holynes to defend & mayntayne thys abuse. And some agayne vnder the pretens of a comon quietnes and peace: As Jeroboam to withdrawe the hartes of the peple from the kyngdom of Juda, dyd institute newe fassions of honorynge God in Samaria cleane contrary to Gods commandement. So lykewyse

haue

to the layte vnder both kyndes.
haue the bysshops instituted newe kyn
des of honozyng God profitable to
theyz purse, and they haue inuented
dyuers ceremonyes good for nothing
saue only to encrease the pomp of pu-
stes, and to bewytch the hartes and
myndes of the people with some colo
and shewe of holynes. And thus the
church is spottyd and blemyshed with
dyuers errors. And many haue perys
shed and many haue theyr consciencys
miserable wounded. Wherfor let not
godly rulers take vpon thē any powr
or auctorite to make any lawes after
theyr owu brayn and indgemēt which
shalbe contrary to the commaudemēt
of God: but let them obey God, pro-
mote Gods glory, and let them haue
an eye and respect vnto christen and
godly conscyences. This is the prin-
cypall office, belongyng vnto all ru-
lers and heades of the church of god.
And what prince soeuer doth contem-
ne these thynges and make wycked &
vniust lawes, to be obserued in the
church of God: The voyce of god doth
threatē hym, saiyng, woo be vnto you,
that

The Sacrament ought to be geuen that is to say, euerlastyng damnacion hangeth ouer your heades which make vniust lawes. Christ dyd so hyghly esteme our sowles, that he redemed them with his owne death. Now sore than is the cruelnes and obstinacy of princes to be reproued which wownd and destroy the sowles of theyr subiectes with wicked lawes? Vvho oughte not to crye owt of such tyranny? Vho wyll not lament thys most greuous seruitute and bondage of the church: Vvherfor we must call vpon God ād pray vnto hym that he wyl haue pity of hys miserable churche so pytyfully tossed, and that he wyll correct these abuses and errors.

And that the abuse of thys Sacramēt may be redressed, first, there must be taken a reformacion in these things folowyng, that is to say that the true doctryne of repētance, of remissyon of synnes, of the exercyses of fayth in the vse of the Sacramentes may be restored. And the masse must be abolysshed and browght vnto the first institucyō. Thys do I monysh of a faythful & relygyous

to the lapte vnder both kyndes.
ligp ous hart & mynd. And I dowt not
but that I haue entreated a relygyous
matter necessary vnto the churche of
god: & I beseche god that he wil wete
saue to bowe and mone the hartes of
all prynces vnto the settyng forth of
the glory of our Lord Jesus Christe &
vnto the sowle helth of hys church ād
congregacyon.

¶ Laude and prayse be vnto God.

Agaynst the priuate masse
done for other.
The .ij. Chapter

That the masse or vse of the sacra- the mat
ment is no sacrifyce nor no suche se mery
work as beynge done of a prist & teth no
applyed for any other, doth meryte remissiō
forgeuenes of synnes neyther for him of siu-
that doth it, nor yet for thē that it is nes.
done for: ¶ whether they be quyck or
deade.

¶ The first reason.

There is no sacrifyce nor neuer was,
which cowld meryte forgyuenes of
synnes, and myght be applyed for

other, saue the onelye one sacrifyce of Christ ones done vpon the crosse. Ergo the masse or the worke of the prist is no sacrifyce to obteyne any remissiō of syn neyther for hymselfe, nor for any other.

Thys doth the .x. chapter of the pistle vnto the Hebrues euidently proue which speketh thus of the sacrifyce of Christ, he hath made perfight for euer with one sacrifyce al them that are sanctifyed. Item he appered ones in the end of the worlde for the destruccyon of synne thorow hys own sacrifyce &c Item thorow the oblacyon of Jesus Christes body ones offred for vs are we sāctifyed. And the Prophete Esay speketh thus of the sacrifyce of Christ. Esa. liij When he hath geuen vp hys soul for a sacrifyce for synne, than shall he se a long endurynge seede etc. Finally the whole scripture teacheth the that the death of Christ alone is the onelye one sacrifyce or oblacyō for synne. For euē in the old testamēt although there were certen sacrifyces which were called sacrifyces for synne, yet they were no

such workes as dyd merite remission of synnes before God, neyther for those which dyd offre thē nor yet for any other: But they were ceremonys instituted for thys purpos, that the true sacrifice of Christ (which should come to be a sacrifice for the sinnes of the whole world) myght be signified by them. And for thys significacyōs sake, they had this name geuen them to be called sacrifices obteyning mercy, or sacrifices for sinne. Not that those workes dyd merite any fauor before God, but because they were figures and tokens wherby the godly sort were put in remembraunce of the true sacrifice which should take away both syn of death, namely the sacrifice of christ which was the promysed sede etc. ¶ For the pystle vnto the Hebrewys where it sayth. It is impossible, sinne to be taken away by the blode of bullockes and gotes etc. doth manifestly testifye that the Leuitical sacrifices cowld merite no remissiō of synnys. Wherfor the godly did vse those ceremonis thus: not that they thought to obteyne remissiō of sinnes before God for doyng those workes,

but

but they vsed them as sygnes and to-
kens wherby God dyd testifye vnto
them that he wold geue them the fede
that was promysed vnto them, whiche
shuld be a sacrifyce for all synne. And
that he wold receyue as many as shul
de byleue it vnto the promes made of
Christ, and that he wold forgyue all
their synnes for that sacrifyce or obla-
cions sake. And they vsyng those cere-
monys, dyd openly testifye that they
dyd byleue to obteyne forgeuenes of
theyr synnes for the fedes sake whiche
was promysed vnto them. And they
vsed those ceremonys, as we vse the sa-
cramentes. Although there was also
another vse of the Leuitical sacrifyces,
that if any person were fownd gilty
in certen offences or defawtes contra-
ry to Moyses lawes, they by vsyng
those sacrifyces, were pronowced to
be alloyed and they were receyued a-
gayn into the cõpany of the peple and
were no longer excluded. Thys was
a certen outwarde alloyement after
the appointement of the lawe. And by
cause of thys alloyemẽt, they were na-

med

med sacrifyces for synne, but they dyd not obteyne any true assoilment or for gevenes before god, saue only thorow the faith in christes sacrifyce that was to come, wherof those outward ceremonys dyd put the faythful in remembrance. Now by thys it may easyly be perceyued, that the opinion of the sacrifyce and of the applicacyon of the worke of the prist, whiche affirmeth thys work to meryte remissyon of synnes both to the prist hymself & to other also, is cleane cõtrary to the doctryne of the gospell cõcernyng the sacrifyce of Christ. For it is manifest that if the death of Christ be the only oblacyon and pryce for the which all synnes be forgeuen, than the worke of the pryste cã meryte no remissyõ of synne. What can be spoken more plainly or more truly, And it is an heynos blasphemy to attribute vnto the worke of the prist that which is christes work alone, and to imagyne that any other sacrifyce is necessary in the church of Christ, As though christes sacrifice which is ones done, were not sufficient to take away

all

all synne and to obteyne forgeuenes of them but that our faith ought to leane vnto the worke of the past to be strengthned by it.

¶ The second reason.

IN the newe Testament there is no maner of seruyce nor no Sacramēt of any valew for the self workes sake, wherfor the masse cā neyther merite remission of synne to hym that doth it, nor yet cā it be applied for other. For the newe testamēt requireth that we shulde honor God with our spirit that is to say, it requyreth the moeyon or inflammacion of the hart, tru fayth, ernest callyng vpon God as Christe sayth: They that wyll worshyp the father ryghtly must worshyppe hym in spyryt, and truth, for the father requyreth such worshyppers to worshyppe hym. For God is a spirite and they that wyll worshyp hym must worship him in spirit and truth. And the Apostles Peter and Paul commande that such spirituall honor shuld be genē vnto god, that is to say, not any outward

Johan. iiij.

 clothe

cloke and face only, but true affecciõs of the hart, true fayth, true feare, true callyng vpõ God and such other, And there is no Sacrament nor ceremony that can please God, without thys true ight and withowt the liuely mocyõs of the hart. Which liuely mocyons be these, True fayth, callyng vpon God, ernest repentance, the feare of God and such like, For the which cause in the Prophetes such workes are refused as be done to please God, for the workes sake, as in Hieremy the vij. whan I brought your fathers owt of the lande of Egypte, I spake not vnto them of any sacrifyces or oblations, but I gaue them thys commandement only saiyng. heare my voyce, and I wyll be your God etc Like sentences be there in other places, & specially in the psalmes as in the psalm xxxix. Thow woldest haue no sacrifyce nor oblacyon. And in the psal. xlix. I wil not reprooue the for any sacrifyce. And agayne, shall I eate the flesh of bullockes etc. Item, call vpon me in the daye of thy troble, and I wyll delyuer the, and

thow

thow shalt honor me. These places do manifestly cõdemne that wicked opynyon of trusting in the outward work of the masse. Although in the old testament, bycause of Gods cõmandemẽt, it was necessary such rytes and ceremonys to be observed, for as much as they were institute in Moyses comon welth as lawes of discipline & restraynt wherby god wolde haue hys peple to be kept in awe and to be ordred. And yet though they were cõmãded of god hymself, they were no true workes of honor acceptable vnto god, sauyng only in those parsons which had the true knowlege of god and perfyght fayth. Neyther dyd those workes iustifye thẽ nor meryte any remissyon of theyr sinnes, Much lesse can the ceremonys or outwarde vse of the Sacramentes of the newe testament be any workes of honor vnto God acceptable for the outwarde workes sake. ¶ Wherfor thys reason of the honor which the newe testament requyreth, doth clerely shewe that the masse can be no such work, as to be any honor of value be-

fore

fore God for the very outward woꝛkes sake. And thys is a wicked and a very hethnysh opinyon to Imagyne that the masse is af any value at al for other men. And there ought no such oppynyon to be suffred in the church of God.

¶ The thyrd reason.

The oppynyon of the sacrifyce of the masse and of applying it for other doth evydently repugne with the doctrine of the iustificacyon of fayth. Which teacheth that we obteyne forgyuenes of our synnes by no other thing saving only by such a faith as certifyeth our consciences that god doth forgeue vs frely for christes sake & for no woꝛke of our owne nor yet of any other. Such a faith only doth ouercome the terroꝛs and feare of synne & death. Thus it must nedes be an vngodly oppynyon to thinck that any remissyon of synne is geuen for the woꝛke of any pꝛyst.

And thys is certen that euery man must nedes receyue remissyon of hys synnes and be delyuered from the

danger

danger of synne and death, thorow his own fayth, as only Abacuk testifieth. The iust man shall lyue by hys owne fayth. Wherfor the worth of the preist can nothyng profyght another man to the remissyon of hys synnes, but euery man must take hold of the benefyt of Christ, and receyue by hys owne fayth. Thys reason doth euidently cō-fute the massyng of prystes for other men, and it declareth plainly that euery mans fayth ought to leane vpō the only one sacrifice of christ. in the which he dyd offre hymself vnto the father, made hym a sacrifyce for vs & prayed for vs as he hymself sayth, I pray not only for them, but for al those whiche shall beleue thorow theyr wordes and preachyng. This is the vayce of christ applyng hys sacrifyce for vs.

¶ The .iiij. reason.

The applyng or doing of the masse for other is cōtrary to the institucyon of Christ. ffor Christ did institute thys sacrament not to be done

for

for other which wold not vse it them selues. But he dyd institute it for euery man to vse it: namely that euery mã eatyng and drinking therof shuld quicken vp theyr fayth and comfort them selues by the remembraunce of Christes benifightes, lyke as the wordes of the institucyon do testifye. Take, eate, and dryncke. Ergo thys Sacrament doth profyght none but such as vse it them selues. For yf one man eate or drinck alone, hys eatyng or drinkinge therof cã nót serue for any other. And it is plainly agaynst the nature of the Sacramentes that they shuld be applied for other, which do not vse them thẽ selues. Lyke as the vse of baptyme is of no valu whan it is vsed of one man for another, neyther can it be applyed for any other man which is not baptised hymself. Item no man can receyue absolucyon for another. And it is truly a wicked vngodlynes and an impudẽt shameles boldnesse to peruert the institucyon of Christ, and to imagyne that the work of the prist in hys masse doth profyght other not receiuing the

It is cõtrary to the word of God that a prist shuld say masse for any other man.

sacrament themselues.

¶ The .v. reason.

It is p-dolatry either to say or to heare masse.

IN thys oppuicn there is manifeste & much Idolatry. Wherfor to speake plainly thys masse is such an abhominacyon as all godly men ought to detest & abhorre, which thyng I wyll thus proue. Fyrst it is Idolatry to set vp or institure any honorynge of God, which is not cõtepned in the worde of god, and specially such one as shuld be takẽ for a honor acceptable for the self workes sake. Thys thyng doth thys sayng cõfirme, they honor me in vayne with the commandementes & tradycyõs of mẽ. And the Prophetes do cal those sacrifyces Idolatry, which were not contepned in the word of God, not cõmanded by hym, as were the sacrifyces done in the hygh places in the grones, and the honorynge of the calues in Bethaue. Itẽ the honoring of the brasen serpent etc. Now thys sacrifyce ād applyinge of the masse for other is such an honor as hath no commandement of God, nor pet agreyth with the institucyon of Christ, but the sacrament is

referred

referred to another vse than it was ordeyned for, the word and commaundement of god neglect, Ergo thys masse is a manifest Idolatry.

¶ Secondarily. The Sacramentes not beyng vsed vnto that end wherun to Christ dyd ordeyne them to be vsed, be no sacramentes, for whan they be vsed to other purposes than they were ordeyned they haue no word of Christ for Christes word pertayneth only to that vse, wherunto he did institute thē. much lesse haue thei the word of christ which be contrary to thys institucyon. Lyke as the circumcisyon of the Jewes or of the turkes which they do vse, is no sacrament. And lyke as the water of baptyme shuld be no sacrament, yf it were referred to other vses than the word and institucion therof requireth as if it were borne abowt to be gased vpon, or to sprinkel men with and to be cast vpon them, or to wash & baptise belles wyth, as the Bysshoppes vse to do: whan it is thus vsed, because the institucyon therof is not kept, it can not be called baptyme but

Ergo the ele. uacion of the sacramēt is Idolatry.

a very mockyng and blasphemy of the sacrament. Likewyse the masse whan it is made a sacrifyce and doue for other, the institucyon of Christ is not kept: Which commandeth the body & blode of the Lorde not to be offred for other, but to be eaten and dronke. But in the masse it is referred to another vse than is contayned in the worde of God. Ergo in thys masse there is no sacramēt. Therfor it is euidēt that there is abhominable Idolatry committed in the masse. For as much as in the steade of the sacramēt where the body and blode of the Lord shuld be ministred and dyuided to other, the masse of the prist is setforth and openly done as a worke which may meryte remissyon of synnes, and profyght the deade, also to release the paines of purgatory. These be fantasticall ipes impudently imagyned of Idolatres and wicked pristes and monkes, whiche do pollute and defyle the holy sacramēt, causyng manyfest idolatry to be committed therwith, and yet they color theyr Idolatry vnder the name of the

Sacrament

sacrament and so they maynteyn their false Idolysh work for lucres sake. It is an horrible thyng euen to remember these abhominacyons and blasphemys. Wherfor all Godly parsons ought to detest and abhorre thys blasphemos peruertyng of the sacrament with theyr whole hartes. And there is no dowt but that God is greuously displeased with the worlde and punisheth it for these so horrible and blasphemos abuses.

¶ Thus hane I brefely shewed that the offryng and applyng of the masse for other is manifestly contrary to the whole doctryne of the gospel of christ and of hys sacrifyce, contrary to the tru worshipping of god, cõtrary to the true doctryne of fayth. Item contrary to the word, commandement and institucyon of Christ. Fynally there is no dowt but that wicked Idolatrye is committed there in, for as much as the sacramentes vsed other wyse than is appoynted in the word of God, and to any other end than they were fyrste instituted for, be no Sacramentes but

vayne, vnprofitable and Idolatrysh sightes. Seyng than it is euident that there is manifest wickednes in suche masses, All maner of masses of pristes one with another ought to be taken away, abolysshed and destroyed. The canon (as they call it) wherein the prist mumbleth by hym selfe many wicked blasphemos prayers vnto sayntes (which is also Idolatry) wherin also sacrifysyng & applyng of it for other is mencyoned in manifest wordes, must be abolysshed and taken away. And the true ryght vse of the Sacrament, must be called and restored agayn according as it was instituted, namely, that it may be a comon supper wherin the body and blode of the Lord may be distributed to all the godly and faythfull. And they eatyng & drinkyng therof may be admonysshed to beleue faythfully, that a pledge ād token is geuen vnto them which testifyeth, that they be the mēbres of christ & that the benefyghtes of christ do truly pertayne vnto thē, & that they sprēkled & washed with the blode of christ.

And

And finally that folysh imaginacyon must be banysshed which maketh a dif ference betwene the worke of the prieste and of the lay mē, as though the worke of the prieste were a singular kynde of worshipp, necessary in the churche of god and such a worke as ought to be done for other. For christ settyth no such dif ference but he wold that it shuld be a comon supper wherin euery one for the exercysyng of hys faith shuld vse and receyue the sacramēt, for as much as he sayth. Take it, eate it, and drinck it etc. And if there be any difference at al, it is only because of the office of the prist, which as a minister shulde gyue vnto other, and the respecte we onely to receyue it of hys hand. But the very sacrament and the vse therof is comon to the whole congregacyon, so instituted and delyuered of Christe. And the prieste is a minister and seruaunt vnto the congregacyon, not to offer and to eate it for other, but to minister and gyue it vnto all, that require it.

¶ An answer vnto all suche reasons as be obiected to proue the masse to be a sacrifyce.

¶ The fyrst obiection.

Like as in the old lawe there were dayly sacrifyces which were done for other (as was that whiche was called the cõtinual sacrifyce etc.) Euen so there must be in the newe testament such a dayly or contynuall sacrifyce which may be offred & done for the whole church or congregacyon. And this dayly sacrifyce is the masse. And to proue thys they alledge a place out of the. vi. cha. vnto the Heb. Euery bisshop takẽ out of mẽ is ordeyned for mẽ in those thinges which pertayn vnto god to offre giftes & sacrifyces for synnes. And vpõ this their reasõ thus, seyng in the newe testamẽt there

be

be bysshops and prestes i must nedes folow, that there must be also in the newe testament some sacrifyce for synne, These folysh men beyng decepued and blinded by this comparyson whereby thei seke to make the ryptes in the newe testament and the Leuitical ryptes a like, they dreame that there must nedes be some such ceremonyal sacrifyce in the newe testament, as were in the old lawe. And thys argumente is sprong vp hereof, because they knowe not what the newe testament is, what be the benefightes of Christ, nor what is the true honor of God. Wherfore fyrst I answere thus vnto all such argumentes of sacrifyce taken out of the comparyson of the old testamēt. That though thys symplytude were of neuer so great strengthe, yet it can not folowe therevpon that the masse meriteth any remissyon of synne eyther for hym that doth it, or els for any other for whome it is applyed. ffor as is before sayd, thys opinyon is contrary to the whole doctryne of the Gospell: which teacheth thys thynge properly

and

and specially that we obteyne remis-
spon of our synnes for no other work
what soeuer it be, but onely for the de-
ath of Christ frely thorow fayth. For
fayth alone ouercometh the feare of
synne and death when we be persua-
ded that our synnes be forgeuen vs by
the mercy of God for christes sake, and
that christes righteousnes and merp-
tes be geuen vnto vs, as Paul sayth,
beyng iustifyed by fayth we haue pe-
ace with God &c.

Thys one answere alone doth take
away all the obiectyons that our ad
uersarys can bryng concernyng the
sacrifyce or applyeng of any work &c.
For neuer a worde of those thynges
whic hare spoken of sacrifyces cā prou-
ue thys, that the outward ministracyō
of the masse is a work that can iustifie
or be applyed for other to obteyn any
remissyon of synne. etc. Now vnto the
second cōparyson taken awt of the la-
we, thus do I answere. In the old Te-
stament those outward rytes or cere-
monys of the sacryfyces were shado-
wes or figures of true thynges which

be

be geuen in the newe testament, as Paul sayth vnto the Colossiās, which are shadowes of thynges to come but the body is christes. Wherfor thys reason is of no value to say. In the lawe there were outward ceremonys of sacrifyces, ergo in the new testamēt there must be lyke ceremonys which must be sacrifyces. For the cōparyson or lyknes of the ryte is not to be sowght but the thing which was signifyed by those figures, whiche signifycacyon is now geuē vnto vs in the gospel. And seyng the gospell is no outward regyment as was Moyses lawe, but geueth vs all those thynges which were signifyed by the Leuitical ceremonys, it hath no nede of any such ryte or sacrifyces. Moreouer the scripture doth clerely teach thys that by those ryte of the sacrifyces for synne in the lawe, the death of Christ was signifyed which is the only sacrifyce and one oblacyon for mankynd that taketh awaye all synne for the which oblacyon god is reconcyled and pleased with vs, as Esay doth interprete

the

the lawe where as he sayth after that he hath geuen vp hys lyfe for synne &c. And saynt Johan: This is the lamb of God which taketh away the synne of the world. But thys must be added also. Whan we speake of sacrifice we must put a difference betwene the kyndes of sacrifyce. For all sacrifyces be not of one sort: but there be .ij. kyndes of sacrifyces. There is one kynde of a sacrifyce which may be called a sacrifyce obteynyng mercy, that is to saye, such a sacrifyce as beyng done for other pleaseth and pacifyeth God, and meryteth also remission of synne. And there is but one such sacrifyce namely the death of the son of God our Lorde Jesus christ. And there was neuer any other such sacrifyce in no tyme nor in no age frō the beginnyng of the world saue that only. Thys prayse perteyneth vnto that bisshop only: which with one oblacyon hath satisfyed for the synnes of the whole world and reconcyled all man kynde vnto God.

¶ And where as in the old lawe certen sacrifyces were called sacrifyces

kyces of mercy, yet they do not merite remission of synnes, nor they were no such sacrifices in dede, but they were so called because they were figures of the sacrifyce that was to come. Thys is a true and a strong answere. There is another kynd of sacrifyces, which differeth much from thys. For where as Dauid sayth, A troubled spirite is a sacrifyce vnto God, here we must nedes put a difference betweue our sacrifyces and the death of Christ. These be called sacrifyces of prayse which do merite no reconciliacyon, but they be done of such as are reconcyled already, that to shew our selfes thankefull we myght geue some honor vnto God confessyng and knowlegyng hym whom in our prayers we call vpon, to be our God, our sauioure and delyuerer. Such a sacrifyce generally is the whole obedyence of the faythful in affliccyon, and in doyng of all good workes commanded by God, accordyng as he hath commanded the to be done. Of such sacrifices speaketh Peter saiyng, Ye be an holy pristhode

to offer

to offer sprytuall sacrifyces etc. But that we shuld knowe, that they do not please God withowt the knowlegyng and fayth of Christ he addeth. Accepta-ble thorow Jesus Christ. For even these sacrifyces of praise do not please for the outward workes sake. Now wyll I answere vnto those places of the old testament, which speake of sa-crifyces. Seyng there is no sacrifyce that obteyneth mercy or reconcyleth vs vnto god sauyng the death of christ alone, it is certen that the oblacyon which is done in the masse or in the sup-per of the lord can be no meritorios sa-crifyce to hym that doth the masse, ney-ther can it be applyed for any other. Thow wilt say why do the olde doc-tors than call it a sacrifyce: I answere ipse as the figures in the old lawe we-re called sacrifyces, even so they cal-led thys a sacrifyce to admonysh vs of christes death which is the true sa-crifyce. But thow wilt axe me than, whether the masse be a sacrifyce of praysle or no: I sayd before there were no sacrifyces of praysle or of thankes

geuyng

geuyng, but those workes which be cõ manded of God, whan they be done after such forme and ordre, as they be commanded to be done by the word of God. For christ saith they honor me in vayne with the commandementes of men. And it is not lawfull for vs to make or set vp any newe kynd of honoryng God, except God shuld commãd vs.

Furthermore the supper of the lord is so institute ãd ordeyned that he that eateth therof shuld there exercyse hys fayth and comfort hym with the remẽberaunce of Christes benyfightes and so gyue thankes vnto God. All these thinges do disagre with the papastical priuate masse wherfor it can be no sacrifyce of prayse or of thãkes geuing. And thus althoughe the applyng of the Sacrament for other were taken awai there ought no masses to be done for workes of prayse or of thankes geuyng. And therfor there ought no comon masses to be institute or ordeined for prayse or thãkes geuyng vnto god but let the institucyon and ordiuance

the masse cã be no sacrifyce of thankes geuyng

of

of God be kept, let the minister distribute the sacrament vnto other and let them vse it for their consolacyon. And whan it is thus eaten and receyued, the prayse, confessyon, and thankes geuing of the repentant thus conforting himself, is a sacrifyce of prayse or thãkes geuyng. But the very outwarde worke it self is no sacrifyce at al. Now vnto the text of the pistle to the Hebrues. Euery Bysshop etc. I answere that the wryter of thys pistle doth applye thys saiyng vnto the onely one Bysshop Christ as the wordes immediatly folowyng do euidently declare. And the whole pystle doth preach of the pristhode of the onely one bysshop Christ. If any man therfor by this text wyll reason that there must be in the newe testament a Bysshop to offer sacrifyces for synne, we must grant hym hys saiyng to be true if he meane christ to be the same Bysshop, for the whole pistle speaketh of hym alone.

They were wont to alledge a place owt of the fyrst of Malachy from the risyng of the sonne vntyll the fal-

lyng

ipng therof my name is magnifyed among the gentyles. And agayn. In euery place there is incense and a pure oblacyon offred vnto my name etc.

Although thys place be violently wrested vnto the masse, yet I answere first. Though we would grant that it speaketh of the masse yet it can not follow therof, that the masse shuld merite remissyon of synne, or that it ought to be a comon work to be doue in the congregacion as though the outward worke done and receyued by the priest alone were a work of prayse, or of thākes geuyng vnto God. Secondarily the workes of the Prophet do declare that he doth speake of the preachynge of the gospel, and of the true works of honorynge God in the newe testamēt: Whereas he saith the name of the lord shall be magnifyed among the gentiles, he signifyeth that the gospel shuld be spred amōg the gētils wherby god shuld be further knowne & glorifyed. Thys preachyng of the Gospel of the mercy of God ingendreth fayth in the hartes of them which receyue the gos

pell. And they work, the true workes of honoring god, which be these. First true fayth, callyng vp god, prayse of God, thankes geuyng, obedience and pacience in affliccyon or tribulaciō etc. This is the name of God glorysfyed. These be a pure and cleane oblacyon, that is to say true and ryght honoryng of God, which are done & performed of them only whose hartes do truly confesse God, and haue a ryght bylefe in hym, and cal vpon hym with a true fayth and trust etc. And the incense and cleane oblacyon which the prophet speketh of, signifye these kyndes of worshippyng God, and they do not signifye any outward ceremonye done without fayth or any knowlege of God. To conclude, what sentences soeuer be gathered owt of the scripture concernyng sacrifyces, let vs alwayes remember, that they do nothynge maynteyne any sacrifyce or any applicacyon of any outward work, for that is both blasphemos and also very Idolatry.

¶ An answere vnto the sayng of the old doctors.

of the masse.

NOw by this which we haue hetherto spoken a mã may easyly answer vnto the sayings of the old doctors, which cal the masse a sacrifyce. For first no man can proue that they dyd meane that the masse shuld be a sacrifyce obteynyng remissyon of sinnes for other or for the prist hymself. He that doth so vnderstond the doctors doth them iniury for these monstros opinions were vtterly vnknowne vnto the primatyue church: yea there was neuer masse vntyl Gregorys tyme, but that many peple dyd receyue the Sacrament together with the prist, but there were certen appointed dayes whan one comon supper or comon receiuyng of the sacramẽt was celebrate, at which many peple (euẽ as many as wold) dyd receyue together the sacramẽt of the body & blode of the Lord. Lyke as at thys day in the greke churches, there are no priuate masses wherein euery prist may deuowre vp the whole sacrament alone and than blesse the peple with the empty chales

but vp on certen dayes there is holde one such comon masse or supper as I haue spoken of. And surely the old fathers wold neuer haue suffred so holy a Sacrament to haue be peruerted so wickedly and so vnreuerently.

After Gregorys tyme the doltysh asseheaded Bysshops and monkes thorow ignorance and superstition, dyd bryng vp thys priuate masse. Vvhich thorow false vnderstondynge of thys word sacrifyce dyd imagyne the masse to be such a work as dyd meryte remissyon both of the fawte and of the payne, and they brought vp the false opinyon in the outward work. Thorow the which opinyon masses dyd increase vnto an infinyte nombre: and because it was a thyng that myght be sold vnto the people, they began to set vp an open fayr and to set them abrode, offryng them to be sold for filthye lucres sake and thei sawe that the gaines came in so fast and easily, that thei went about by al meanes to let them dayly in more hygh estimacyon amõg the people. They alledge a saying of

Tertulliane

Tertulliane in hys boke de corona militis where he sayth thus: we do also make oblacyons euery yeare for the deade & for birth daies &c. This place do they wickedly and falsly wrest vnto masses for dead soules. Whereas Tertulliane sayth not the worke or saying of the masse to be a sacrifyce for the deade which can redeme them frō theyr sinnes etc. Neyther doth he speake in this place of the lordes supper, but in byrth and buryall dayes the people were wont to bring meate and such other thinges vnto the temples to be distributed vnto the poore. These were called oblacyons or gyftes of loue. And of thys custome of the people doth tertulliane speake, which was a custome of the hethen and dyd remayne in tertullians tyme, but they were afterward forbidden. And it is euydent both by tertulliane hymself and by other wryters also that they called not the masses sacrifyces, or oblacions for the deade, but prayers and thankes geuyng vnto god called them sacrifyces. For Tertullyan writyng vnto scapula

sayth thus: we do offre sacrifyces for the helth of our Emperor and Prince, vnto our God, and hys, but after such sort as God commandeth, namely, by pure fayth. And Cyprian speaketh after such a sort of the martyrs, sayinge we offer sacrifices for them etc. because in theyr prayers mencion was made of the martyrs, and thankes were geuen vnto God, that he had ayded & strengthned thē. And saynt Austen sayth ad questiones dulcitū. Vvhan we offer sacrifyces of almes or of any other thyng for the deade, they are geuyng of thankes etc. And euen so doth Dionisius wryte of the ceremonys of deade corsys, that the people were cōmanded to gyue thankes vnto God in theyr prayers that he which was deade, dyd depart Godly and faythfully owt of hys lyfe. These thynges do sore disagre with the wicked opinyons of the men in our tyme, concernyng purgatory, and offryng of masses to redeme the paynes of the deade etc.

¶ Agaynst the comon masse daily done for the peple to come vnto, only to heare

to heare it, and to see the elevacyon.

The.iiij. chapter.

I Suppose that such as have any lernyng or vnderstandyng at all, will not maynteyne the deuillysh opinyon of applying the masse for other but they will flee vnto a more suttyll interpretacyon and opinyon, and they will say that they reteyne the masse not to applye it for other but to gyue God thankes in it. They will reason that it is lawfull for one alone to gyue God thanckes in the congregacyon, the respdue of the people lokyng and gasyng vpō hym: as if one alone shuld reade a psalme. Afterward they adde prayers for the deade and for other which they say to be of valewe vnder the way of peticyon or intercessyō for them. By thys suttylty they color ād set furth theyr abuses. And they thinck them selues worthy an hygh commendacyon of wyt and wysdom for inuentyng such suttyl imaginacyons. And they that do not extoll and prayse these colors and suttelties wyth hygh admiracyon, they crye owt of them & cal

them soles and asses. Furthermore what tyranny do they exercyse against the faythfull which confesse faythfully that they do abhorre the Idolatry of the masse.

Now we call and crye vnto the O Lord Jesu christ, which prayeng for thy church, diddest say. O father sanctifye them in the verite or truth, thy worde is the verite and truth etc.

We beseech the that thou wilt wete saue to delyuer thy church and cõgregacion from all sophistical suttilties. For thys mischefe hath euer couered darkued & kept downe the truth. We beseech the also that thou wilt geue vnto all Princes and rulers louyng and fauorable hartes towarde the truth, that they may seke the glory of God, and not any other vtilite in ordrynge, and makyng lawes for religyon. For it happyth oft tymes that Princes in makyng lawes for stablyshyng of religyon, be ouer much bent vnto theyr owne vtilyte.

Bysshops wil haue masses maintayned for the maiutenance of theyr owne

owne dignite pomp and lucre. The comon peple loue the masse bycause thei thinck it a soueren & ready medicyne agaynst al aduersyte, sore, disease or weakenes, as the disposicyon of mē is naturally bent vnto Idolatry and vnto the trust in workes, whan they neyther vnderstand the true fayth nor yet study to hold or to kepe it. Kynges and Prynces, serue, obey, and please the lustes and affections of the Bysshops, & they mayntepn the olde errors & abuses for a comō peace & quietnes. And for thys cause the most part of princes Bysshops, and of the people also hath resisted the truth in all tymes & ages. But God whan he wold reforme hys church hath euer called some of euery order and degree of men to mainteyne and defend the truth, whan it began to spryng vp: in which nomber wolde to God some kynges wold wete saue to be cownted now in this time, that thei wold set furth and promote the glory of Christ, and haue respect both vnto theyr own and to theyr subiectes saluacion, anh that thei wold no lōger, ayde

why the masse is so higly estemed

the

the wycked sort which warre & fyght agaynst Christ, and defend or maynteyne Idolatry. Now wyll I set forth a breke and eupdent confutacyon of thys sophistical suttyl excuse and maintenance of masses.

¶ The first reason.

THys sophysticall suttelty is nothyng but a dissimulacion and inverye dede the vyces before rehersed (as the applyng of it for other and the opinion in the outward work etc.) do remayne styll. For they retayne stil the canon wherin is contayned in expresse wordes the applicacyon. Also so long as thys maner of saiyng masse endureth, thys opinion shall neuer fal away, that it is a comon work of valu for other, yea and that the outwarde work also doth profyght other. Else, why shuld it be done? and why shulde the prystes retayne els a syngular maner in receyuyng of the sacrament varying from the comon and brotherly receyuyng of the people? Such a masse is papistically and dowtles full of Idolatry, for it varyth farre from the institucyon

stitucyon of Chryst. Lyke as it is truly spoken of Images that God heareth men no more at one Image than at another (because we ought not to bynd God to any place whereunto he hath not bownd hymself by his word) lyke wyse the Sacramentes beyng not vsed to that end wherunto they were ordeyned or otherwyse vsed than they were ordeyned, be no sacraments, but Idle, vayne, and wicked vngodly sightes or spectacles, as now the Jewysh or turkysh circumcisyon is. Wherfor euery man may iudge what maner of honorynge of God, there is in thys popish masse, where so many thinges are hesped together contrary to the institucyon of Christ as the sacrifyce, the applyinge of it for other and the mervelynge of the outward work etc. All these thynges do remayne so long as the poppish maner of sayinge masse with the canon, and the ceremonys that be patched therunto do endure. For the masse as it is now vsed euen from the begynnynge vnto the ende, is nothyng els than the popes creature

of

olhys owne makyng and ordeyning. These thynges be euydent ynowgh.

¶ The second reason.

IMagyne that the opinyon of applying of it for other myght be take away & brought out of the peples heades, yet they wold haue the sacrifyce to remayne styl, which is not contayned in the wordes of Christes institucyon. And only Christ hymself dyd offer himself for a sacrifyce and he wil not be offred of vs. Item it is lawful for no mā to make any ordinance of worshippyng God without the cōmandement of God. But yf this forsaid masse shuld be kept stil there shuld remain an ordinance of honorynge God not cōmanded by God, there shuld remaine also a maner varyng from the comon maner of the people whan they receyue the sacrament, which singular maner shud be esteemed of al men for a speyall and necessary seruice of God, in the church of God. Wherfore seynge no maner of scrupyl ought to be brought

brought into the churche which is not commanded by God, let vs kepe the maner and forme that is taught vs in the Gospel, specially seyng holy Paul doth commãd in expresse wordes that many shuld receyue the Sacrament together, and that we shuld vse the Lordes supper, as a Sacrament to quickẽ by our fayth. and to comfort our selues thorow the remembrance of christes benifyghtes, and than to gyue thnakes vnto Christ for so great a delyuerance and redemption. Let vs not imagyne that the outward ceremonye is a sacrifyce, or any honor to God. Thys was the maner of the primatyue church. For vntyll Gregorys time in a maner, there were no priuate masses at al. Our aduersaris stampe and stare saiyng that we forsake the vse and maner of the church, and they requyre the vse and old custome of the church to be had in estimacyon and regarded. Wut they do vs great iniury. For they them selues be cleane gone from the custome and example of the true church, and they haue receiued

one mã ought not to receiue the Sacrament alone.

newe

newe kyndes of seruyce inuented by the rashnes of mans brayne which the old primatyue church dyd neuer knowe. Dyonysius where he setteth out the maner of vsyng the Sacrament, he maketh no mencyon of any sacrifyce or oblacyon, and yet he was very curyos in describing al ceremonys. The applyng of it also was vtterly vnknowen vnto the prymitiue church: for the latyne canon which is in the poppysh masse is as it were a newe patched beggers cloke, augmented by a lytle and a lytle, as Gregory doth testyfye which sayth, that it was gathered or patched together of a certē schole dūct. And it differeth in many notable places from the greke canons, wherof there be ij. which also differ betwene thē-selues in certen notable thynges. And thys saying in the latyne canon which sayth (thys sacrifyce is offred to redeme the quyck and the deade etc,) is not in the greke canon. Wherfor this latyne canon ought to be banysshed, for as much as it teacheth that the Sacrament shuld be applyed for other contrary

trary to the doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ, and of the iustificacion of faith: and it contemneth other inconueniencis, there is mencion also made of the intercession of sayntes. And the pope whereas he sayth immediatly after the eleuacion, that he doth offer the son of God, he requireth euen there that his oblacion shulde please God, as well as the sacrifice of Abell did etc. It appeareth that these thinges were cõfusely and folishly heaped ād patched together of some vnlerned asse. And al men that haue any lerning do perceiue that these thinges are nedefull to be reformed and amended. And surely the negligence and sluggyshnes of bysshopps is to rebuked: whiche seyng these many yeares that there haue bene so many manifest abuses of masses, did neuer ones think of any reformacion of the. And what an abhominacion it is before God, to abuse this Sacrament, Paul doth declare manifestly inowgh, whereas he saith vnto the Corinthians. Let euery man proue himselfe, for who soeuer eateth

eateth it vnworthily, is gilty of the bo dy and blode of the lord. And there is no dowt but that God ponyshed vs with dyuers plages both manifest ād pryuy, for abusyng of thys sacramēt. For god is wont to pounysh Idolatry most greuously. Wherfore we desyre God with our whole hartes that he wyl put it in all rulers hartes and myndes that thei may begyn to refor me theyr churches in thys so hygh and weyghty a matter.

Now although thys matter of the masse myght be entreated more large ly, yet we haue comprysed here the principall somme and effect of the mat ter. The maner that we vse is agrea ble with the institucyon of Christ, with Paul, and with the whole primityue church. Our sentence and iudgement of the vse of the sacrament is takē out of the true doctryne of Christes sacri fyce and of the iustificacyon or ryght wys makyng of faith. These thinges be certen, firme and euydent and cā by no meanes be ouerthrowne or disprou ued although parauenture some wyll

yet

yet go about to excuse and clothe theyr masses with suttyll reasons. For I am not ignorãt how craftye foxes are wõt alwayes to paynte theyr errors with godly blasyng and counterfet colors. But whosoeuer wyl seke the glory of God, and haue any respect to the profyght and the saluacyon of the cõgregacyon of Christe, let them prefer the truth before all counterfet colored and sophisticall reasons. This is mete for al them to do which feare God, and desyre to call vpon hym rightly, and haue any affection or loue toward hys church.

And we dyd meruell sore at the actes of Inglande concernyng religyon in the which whereas no maner of reformacyon of the abuses of the masse is ones mencyoned, yet the priuate masse is plainly stablysshed, and confirmed. We wonder sore that the bysshops of Inglande, dare be so bolde as to affyrme the priuate masse to be necessary, seyng with in these. iiii. hundreth yeres the pure primatiue church had neuer hard therof. And do ye think

the mas se is not iiij. hun dreth pe are olde

that the churche before these .iiij. hundreth peres was ignorant of any thyn ges that were necessary? The englisch bysshops ought to haue bene more cir cumspect, and not to haue pronounced or determined any thing in the church so rasshely and impudently. For if pri uate masses be necessary, than do they condemne the whole primatiue church which had none at all. And whereas they adde those masses to be profita ble vnto the people to prouoke them vnto Godlynes, that sentence is put doutfully, and although thei name not the applying of it for other, yet they confirme the self same error in the har tes of the peple.

The pri uate masse condem nith the Apo stels ād the whole primatiue church

Furthermore although they wolde not confirme the applicacpō, but think that it is a profitable example, because the peple is admonisshed to remember the passion of Christ, yet thys sight or example doth more hurt than it doth good, for in those masses there is no dowt much Idolatry and so the peple is compelled there to commit Idola try.

For

For the Sacrament beyng otherwyse vsed than it was first ordeyned, is no sacrament. Ergo the people are decey ued and so cõmyt ydolatry. This sen tence is as true as can be. Wherfore we wysh and desyre in our dayly prai ers that the church of God may be de lyuered from Idolatry, and that the true seruyce and worshippyng of god may be restored agayn to the glory of God and the profyght and saluacion of the people.

¶ Glory and prayse be vnto God.

¶ Of the powre auctorite and iurisdiccion of Bysshops, iiij.

The Gospell geueth a commande ment vnto them which haue ru le ouer any church, to teach the gospell, to preach remission of synnes and to minister the sacramentes, And it geueth them also a certen iurisdicci on, namely a commandement to excõ municate al such as haue cõmitted any notable crymes & to assoyle thẽ again

whan they repent and amend. And it is certen by the iudgementes of al mē euen of oure aduersarpes, that this auctority is comon by the lawe of God vnto all curates, whether they be called parsons, vicars or Bisshops. And for thys cause doth S. Hierome teache plainly that in the scripture all they whiche haue rule oner any church be Bysshops and priestes. And he alledgeth this text out of Tite. Therfor haue I left the in Creta, that thou shuldest ordeyn pastors in euery city. And a litle after he addeth. A Bisshop must be the husband of one wyfe etc. ¶Item Peter and John call themselues priestes. And saynt Hierom sayth more oner that afterward one was chosen to be ouer the residue for a remedy of schisme or dissension, lest euery one takyng vpon hymself autorite, shulde destroye the church of Christ. And euē at Alexandria from the tyme of marke the Euangelist vntyll the tyme of the Bysshops Eldras, and Dionysius, che priestes dyd euer elect and chose one among them whom they set in a hygher

bysshoppes and prystes are of lyke autorite.

a hygher place, and hym dyd they name theyr Bysshop, lyke as if an hoste shuld chose a captenamong thē selues. And the decons dyd chose one amōge them whom they thought to be moste diligent and hym they named an Archedecon. For what doth a Bysshop (the orderyng or appoyntyng of other except) but that any prist may do the same.

Thus sayut Hierom teacheth that the difference betwene the degre of a Bysshop and a nother prieste or pastor, was made by mans auctorite. For els they haue lyke pour and auctorite in the scripture. But afterward this one thyng namely the orderyng or admittyng of other dyd set a difference betwene them, for it was decreyd that one Bysshop shuld ordeyne and admit ministers in other churches, but seyng that the degre of a Bysshop and of a pastor do not dyffer by the lawe of God, it is euydent that if any pastor or curate make any godly ordinance in hys church, it is confirmed by the lawe of God. Wherfor seyng the ordy-

nary bisshops be enemis of the church and wyll not do theyr office as they ought to doo, the church hath hyr auctorite. For where so euer the churche is, there is auctorite to minister the Gospell. Wherfor the church must nedes retayne auctorite, to call, chose, ordeyne and admyt ministres. And thys auctorite is a gyft properly geuen vnto the churche, which no mans auctorite can take away from it, as Paul testifyeth vnto the Ephesians, where he sayth: He ascended and gaue gyftes vnto men. And he nombreth among the proper gyftes of the church pastors and preachers. And he sayth that they be geuen to minister vnto the edifying of the body of christ. Thus I say, whersoeuer the true church is, there must nedes be auctorite to elect, and administre: as in a case of necessyte a lay man may assoyle and be the minister or curate of a nother man: as S. Austen doth tell a story of .ij. christen mē beyng in danger of deth vpon the see, wherof the one being lately turned vnto the fayth was baptysed of the o-

ther,

ther, and immediatly the same man af-
ter he was baptysed dyd assoyle the o-
ther. And those wordes of christ which
testifye that the keyes were geuen vn-
to the whole church, and not vnto certē
persons only, do approue the same.
Whersoeuer ij. or iij. be assembled in
my name, I am in the myddes of them
etc. Fynally thys sentence of Peter
doth also confirme the same. Yow be a
kynglе prysthode. Which wordes do
pertayne vnto the true church. For
that only hath a pristhode, and therfor
it hath auctorite to chose and admyt
mynysters. Which thyng also the co-
mon custome of the church doth testi-
fye. For in old tyme the comon people
dyd chose pastors and bysshops. And
afterward came the bysshop of that dy
oces or els of the next, which dyd con-
firme hym that was elect, by the lay-
ing on of his handes, and theyr orders
geuyng was no other thyng thā suche
an approbacyon. And in proces of ty-
me ther came vp newe ceremonis whe
rof Dionisius maketh mencio of diuer
se, but he is but a newe & forged autor.

And afterward euery bysshop inuented hys imaginacyon and so at length thys sentence was added (I gyue the powꝛ and auctoꝛite to sacrifyce foꝛ the quyck & foꝛ the deade, etc.) but by whō no man can tel, foꝛ Dionysius maketh no mencyon of thys sentence. Thus is manifest, that the whole church, that is it to say euen the comō people, haue auctoꝛyte by the woꝛd of God, to chose and admytte mynistrers oꝛ curates. And the wickednes and tyꝛanny of bysshops do minister occasyon vnto sedycyon and discoꝛd: foꝛ Paul commādeth that all Bysshops which teach, defend and maintayne wicked doctryne, wicked and false Gods seruyce, shuld be reputed as accursed. Thus haue I spoken of the oꝛdeynyng oꝛ admittyng of mynisters, and wherein a bysshop and a nother pꝛist differ after the iudgemēt of saynt Hierome. Wherfoꝛ it were inuayne to entreate of other offyces of Bysshops, we nede not to speake neyther of the confirmacyon of childern and of the halowyng of Belles which in a maner, be all the woꝛkes that bysshops

It is lawful euery parysh to chose them a curate.

shops do now adays. Now must we say somwhat of their iurisdiccion.

It is euydent that the comon iurisdiccion to excommunicate such as haue committed manifest crymes, doth pertayne generally vnto all curates. And this iurisdiccion, the bysshopps (lyke tyrannes) haue transferred vnto themselues alone, and they haue turned it to get mony with. For it is manifest that the officyals, and commissarys as they call them, do vse an vngodly liberty and pour not to be suffered For they haue vexed and excommunicate men eyther for couetousnes sake, or els for some other priuate affeccyō, without any order of iudgemēt. And what a tyranny is it that officyals or commissarys shuld haue any auctorite in cytes to condemne or excommunicate any man for their own pleasure without any ryght order or proces of iudgement. And in what thynges haue they abused this auctorite, not in punysshyng worthy fawtes, but for breakyng of fastyng and feastfull dayes, and for suche lyke trifyls. Onely

sometyme

sometyme they ponysh adulterp, and yet in that matter thei vexe and troble often times, innocent and honest men. Seyng therfor the bysshops haue take violentlp vnto them selues thys iurisdiccpō, and haue abused it filthyly, no man nedeth for that cause obey Bysshops. But in right and lauful causes why shuld we not obey them. It were rpght and reason to gpue the same iurisdiccpon vnto Godly pastors and Curates, and to see that they vse it as they ought to do, to the reformacpon and amendement of the peple and to the glorp of God.

¶ Another iurisdiccpon there is for those causes, which after the canon lawe do pertepn vnto the spiritual courte as they call it, which consist specialp in matrimoniall causes. And these courtes also haue the Bysshoppes by mās lawe. And it is not long sins they haue had them: for it appereth by Justinyan that all iudgementes for causes of matrimonp dyd pertepne in his tyme vnto tempozall iudges.

And the tempozall rulers are com-

manded

manded bythe lawe of God to vse the se iudgements, if the bisshops be negligent. Wherfor it is not necessary for vs to obey bysshops for thys iurisdiccyõs sake neyther. And truly seing they haue made diuerse vniust lawes for matrimonys, which they exercyse and folowe in theyr iudgements, it were necessary euen for thys cause, that other iudgemẽts were institute and ordeyned, for the lawes of spiritual affynyte are vniust. And it is an vniust lawe also, which forbiddeth the innocent party to mary after any dyuorcement is made. It is an vniust lawe, which alloweth generally all preuy and deceyghtful contractes agaynst the auctorite of the parentes. It is an vniust lawe which forbiddeth preistes to mary. And there be innumerable other snares of consciences in theyr lawes, which were in vayne to reherse by name. Let this be sufficyent, to say that there be many vniust lawes of the pope, whiche the rulers ought to take away, and to make other for them.

Seyng therfor that Bysshops whiche

be

be addicte and sworne in theyr hartes vnto the pope, do defend and maintey ne wicked doctrine, wicked Gods seruyce, and do not ordeyne godly preachers, but help and furder the tyrannye of the pope, and haue taken away all maner of iurisdiccyon from curates, and vse that same only to practise their tyrannye, fynally seyng they obserue many vniust lawes in causes of matrimony, there be causes inowe and those necessary also, why the churches nede not to knowledge thē as Bishops. And let all men remembre, that possessyons were geuen vnto bysshopps, as almosses for the ministracyon and vtilyte of the church, as the rule saith. The reward was geuen for the offyce and labor. Wherfor they can not receyue those almosses with good consciences. And in the meane tyme they defraud the churches and comon welth, which haue nede of those possessyons, to norysh true curates and preachers, to helpe scholers, and to mayntayne true courtes specially for matrimonis etc, Peter dyd prophecy that there shuld

Bysshops that do not their offyce are ;thenes.

shuld come wicked Bysshops, whiche shuld abuse the almes of the church to mainteyne theyr wicked lustes, theyr offyce and duty neglect. But let them be sure, whiche do thus defraud the church, that God wyl scourge and plage them for theyr wickednes in thys behalfe. And Kynges and Prynces which be the speciall membres of the churche oughte to haue a respect vnto the church, and to se that all errors be takeu away, and that mennys conscyences be no longer snared, as God exhorteth Prynces by name sayng. Now ye Prynces receyue vnderstondynge, and be ye lerned ye iudges of the erth etc. For the chefe care of Kyngs ought to be, to set forth the glory of God, Vvherfore it is highly agaynst theyr honor to applye theyr auctoryte, and pour to the confirmynge of Idolatry, and other infinite abhominable errors and to assent to the deathes and banishments of the seruantes of God. And what helpeth it to haue many councels, assembles, or parlaments, yf Bysshops wyll suffer nothing to be reformed

Kinges be the speciall mẽbres of the churche

med contrary to theyr mynd, If Princes wil permyt no men to vtter theyr iudgementes freely without harme or blame. So long as thys tyranny remayneth, how can the church be healed. Surely so many as allowe the popes ordinances and maintayne hys doctryne, tradicions and inuented seruyce to honor God with, they infecte and pollute themselues with Idolatry and blasphemos opinions, they are gilty also of all the blode of the faithfull, which the pope doth persecute, they mynysh also the glory of God, and hinder the saluacyon of hys people, for as much as they confirme errors and abhominable wickednes vnto al their posterite for euer.

Glory and prayse be vnto God.

Imprinted by my Richard Jugge.